

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
AUSTIN DIVISION

EDWARD TURNBULL, IV,

Plaintiff,

v.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE
STATE BAR OF TEXAS, et al.,

Defendants.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

1:23-CV-314-RP

ORDER

Before the Court is the report and recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Mark Lane concerning Defendants’¹ Motions to Dismiss, (Dkts. 22, 24, 27, 32, 35, 38, and 46). (R. & R., Dkt. 57). Plaintiff timely filed objections to the report and recommendation. (Objs., Dkt. 58).² Two responses to Plaintiff’s objections were also filed, urging the Court to adopt the report and recommendation. (Dkts. 60, 61).

A party may serve and file specific, written objections to a magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations within fourteen days after being served with a copy of the report and recommendation and, in doing so, secure *de novo* review by the district court. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). Because Plaintiff timely objected to the report and recommendation, the Court reviews the report and recommendation *de novo*. Having done so and for the reasons given in the report and recommendation, the Court overrules Plaintiff’s objections and adopts the report and recommendation as its own order.

¹ Plaintiff Edward Turnbull, IV (“Plaintiff”) sued the Board of Directors of the State Bar of Texas (“SBOT”), the Commission for Lawyer Discipline (“CLD”), the Office of the Chief Disciplinary Counsel, and over 50 individuals associated with SBOT and/or the CLD. (Dkt. 20, at ¶¶ 2–18).

² It appears that Plaintiff inadvertently filed identical objections twice. (*Compare* Dkt. 58 *with* Dkt. 59). Accordingly, the Court considers these identical, and only cites to the first docket entry.

Accordingly, the Court **ORDERS** that the report and recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Mark Lane, (Dkt. 57), is **ADOPTED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants' Motions to Dismiss, (Dkt. 27, 35, 38, 46), are **GRANTED**. Plaintiff's claims against Defendants are **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE** for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. The remaining Motions to Dismiss, (Dkt. 22, 24, and 32), are **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**.

The Court will enter final judgment by separate order.

SIGNED on February 27, 2024.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'R. Pitman', is written over a horizontal line.

ROBERT PITMAN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE